

REMARKS

Claims 1-40 are pending in this application. Claims 17, 19, 20, 30-33 and 37 have been amended. Claims 1-16, 18, 21, 22, 34-36 and 40 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 41 and 42 have been added. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested in view of the above amendment and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections

Claims 17-20, 22, 30, 31, and 37-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) as being anticipated by Tashiro (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0196393).

Amended claim 17 recites, *inter alia*, a light transmitting portion including a transparent area and an opaque area, and a width of the transparent area being larger than a width of a sealant. *See e.g.*, Fig. 14A of the present application.

Applicants respectfully submit that Tashiro does not disclose or suggest that a width of a transparent area is larger than a width of a sealant. In contrast, Tashiro discloses that a width of an opening between the conductive members (78) is smaller than a width of the sealant (6). *See e.g.*, Fig. 43a of Tashiro.

Accordingly, claim 17 is not anticipated by Tashiro.

Amended claim 30 recites, *inter alia*, reflecting irradiated light toward a light transmission portion. Applicants respectfully submit that Tashiro does not disclose or suggest the above claimed features. In contrast, Tashiro discloses reflecting light toward a sealant (12) and a black matrix (8). *See e.g.*, Fig. 19 of Tashiro.

Accordingly, claim 30 is not anticipate by Tashiro.

Amended claim 37 recites, *inter alia*, a conductive layer having a plurality of slits located at the overlapping and elongated along a signal transmission of the conductive layer, and a width of the slits being larger than a distance between the slits. See *e.g.*, Figs. 15 and 17 of the present application.

Applicants respectfully submit that Tashiro does not disclose or suggest a width of slits being larger than a distance between the slits. In contrast, Tashiro discloses a width of the wiring (78) is equal to a width between the wirings (78). See *e.g.*, Fig. 43b and paragraph [0345] of Tashiro.

Accordingly, Tashiro does not anticipate claim 37.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 17-20, 22, 30, 31 and 37-40 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and that claims 17-20, 22, 30, 31 and 37-40 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 23-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tashiro in view of Murade et al. (US 6,859,247).

As discussed above, Tashiro does not disclose “a light transmitting portion including a transparent area and an opaque area, and a width of the transparent area being larger than a width of a sealant”. Murade does not cure the deficiency of Tashiro. Thus, independent claim 17 is patentable over Tashiro in view of Murade. Since claims 23-27 depend from claim 17, these claims are also patentable.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 23-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and that claims 23-27 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 28 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tashiro in view of Murade and Moon et al. (US 2001/0048502).

As discussed above, Tashiro and Murade do not disclose "a light transmitting portion including a transparent area and an opaque area, and a width of the transparent area being larger than a width of a sealant". Moon does not cure the deficiency of Tashiro and Murade. Thus, independent claim 17 is patentable over Tashiro in view of Murade and Moon. Since claims 28 and 29 depend from claim 17, these claims are also patentable.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 28 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and that claims 28 and 29 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 32 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tashiro.

As discussed above, Tashiro does not disclose or suggest reflecting irradiated light toward a light transmission portion, as claimed in claim 30. Claims 32 and 33 depend from claim 30. Accordingly, claims 32 and 33 are also patentable.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 32 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and that claims 32 and 33 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

For the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner's early and favorable action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if he has any questions or comments in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank Chau

Reg. No. 34,136

Jaewoo Park

Ltd. Rec. No. L0302

Attorneys for Applicant(s)

F. Chau & Associates, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889